

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
2 Attorney General of the State of California  
3 DANE R. GILLETTE  
4 Chief Assistant Attorney General  
5 GERALD A. ENGLER  
6 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
7 PEGGY S. RUFFRA  
8 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
9 MICHAEL D. O'REILLEY, State Bar No. 72144  
10 Deputy Attorney General  
11 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
12 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
13 Telephone: (415) 703-5965  
14 Fax: (415) 703-1234  
15 Email: michael.oreilley@doj.ca.gov

16 Attorneys for Respondent

17 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18  
19 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
20  
21 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

22  
23 STEVE KENT BADUE,

24 Petitioner,

25 C 07-4612 VRW (PR)

26 v.

27 R. WATKINS, PAROLE AGENT,

28 Respondent.

19 MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION AS UNTIMELY

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
Attorney General of the State of California  
DANE R. GILLETTE  
Chief Assistant Attorney General  
GERALD A. ENGLER  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
PEGGY S. RUFFRA  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
MICHAEL D. O'REILLEY, State Bar No. 72144  
Deputy Attorney General  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
Telephone: (415) 703-5965  
Fax: (415) 703-1234  
Email: michael.oreilley@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Respondent

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

## **STEVE KENT BADUE,**

Petitioner,

C 07-4612 VRW (PR)

**MOTION TO DISMISS  
PETITION AS UNTIMELY**

**R. WATKINS, PAROLE AGENT,**

## Respondent.

## INTRODUCTION

21 Respondent hereby moves to dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus for failure to  
22 comply with the statute of limitations established by the Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty  
23 Act of 1996 (AEDPA) as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

24 A motion to dismiss in lieu of an answer on the merits is proper when a petition is  
25 procedurally defective. *See White v. Lewis*, 874 F.2d 599, 602 (9th Cir. 1989); *O'Bremski v. Maass*,  
26 915 F.2d 418, 420 (9th Cir. 1990); Rules Governing 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Cases, Rule 4, and Advisory  
27 Committee Notes, *see also Jablon v. Dean Witter & Co.*, 614 F.2d 677, 682 (9th Cir. 1980) (motion  
28 to dismiss proper if time bar is clear from face of complaint).

## **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

By information filed on October 10, 2002, the Santa Clara County District Attorney charged petitioner with failing to update his sex offender registration within five days of his birthday. Cal. Pen. Code § 290(g)(2)<sup>1/</sup>; count 1, and having suffered a prior prison term as a one year sentence enhancement. § 667.5, subd. (b). Exhibit 1 at 20-23.

On February 3, 2003, petitioner waived his right to a jury trial. Exhibit 1 at 60. Trial before the court took place on February 5, 2003. The court found petitioner guilty as charged and found the enhancement allegation true. Exhibit 1 at 62-65.

On March 6, 2003, the court denied probation and sentenced petitioner to a state prison term of two years. In the interest of justice, the court struck the prison prior. Exhibit 1 at 90-91.

12 On August 13, 2003, petitioner filed an opening brief in the California Court of Appeal  
13 for the Sixth District. Exhibit 2.

14 On October 24, 2003, respondent filed a brief in opposition. Exhibit 3.

15 On December 3, 2003, petitioner filed a reply brief. Exhibit 4.

16 On April 14, 2004, the Court of Appeal issued a decision affirming the judgment in its  
17 entirety. Exhibit 5.

18 On July 23, 2007, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the California  
19 Supreme Court (S154680). The petition was denied on August 15, 2007 with the notation “(See  
20 *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300304.)” Exhibit 6. The  
21 citations refer to previous holdings that a petition for habeas corpus is deemed insufficient if it fails  
22 to explain unreasonable delay in filing or consists of vague, ambiguous, or conclusory allegations.<sup>2/</sup>

24       1. All further statutory references are to the California Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

26        2. Petitioner has filed five habeas petitions with the California Court of Appeal for the Sixth  
27 District but none since his conviction in this case, *i.e.*, H020587 filed 10-13-99, H020620 filed 10-  
28 20-99, H020894 filed 12-15-99, H021159 filed 2-23-00, and H021280 filed 3-27-00. All were  
Motion Dismiss Petition As Untimely - *Badue v. Watkins* - C 07-4612 VRW (PR)

1 Petitioner filed his habeas petition with this court on January 16, 2008. We explain below  
 2 why the petition fails to comply with the deadline provided by 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A), and  
 3 therefore must be dismissed.

4 **ARGUMENT**

5 **THE PETITION IS UNTIMELY**

6 Because petitioner filed his habeas petition with this Court on January 16, 2008, his case  
 7 is governed by the provisions of AEDPA. *Lindh v. Murphy*, 521 U.S. 320, 336 (1997). Before  
 8 passage of AEDPA, state prisoners virtually had unfettered discretion regarding when to initiate a  
 9 federal habeas action. Under AEDPA, a one-year statute of limitations was imposed. 28 U.S.C. §  
 10 2244(d)(1)(A). The one year limitation begins to run for state prisoners from the date upon which  
 11 the judgment becomes final. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). AEDPA provides for tolling of this one-year  
 12 limitations period for the “time during which a properly filed application for State post-conviction  
 13 or other collateral review . . . is pending.” § 2244(d)(2). AEDPA’s one-year statute of limitations  
 14 period is constitutional. *Green v. White*, 223 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2000).

15 Here, petitioner’s conviction became final on January 31, 2004, 40 days after the Court  
 16 of Appeal’s decision affirming the judgment was filed and the time to file a petition for review in  
 17 the California Supreme Court expired. See California Rules of Court, rules 8.264, 8.500(e)(1); 28  
 18 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). During the time between January 31, 2004 and January 31, 2005, petitioner  
 19 had no “properly filed application for state post-conviction or other collateral review” pending.  
 20 Therefore, the final day for petitioner to have filed a petition seeking federal habeas corpus relief  
 21 was January 31, 2005.

22 Petitioner filed a petition in state court on July 23, 2007, approximately two-and-one-half-  
 23 years (934 days) beyond the deadline. That filing did not revive the statute of limitations (*Jimenez*  
 24 *v. Rice*, 276 F.3d 478, 482 (9th Cir. 2001)) which means no time was tolled during the one year  
 25 limitations period provided by § 2244(d)(1)(A).

26  
 27 S088753 filed 5-30-00, S089262 filed 6-20-00, S089996 filed 7-19-00, S090543 filed 8-7-00,  
 28 S090648 filed 8-10-00, S091861 filed 9-29-00, S094320 filed 1-11-01, S096217 filed 3-23-01, and  
 S113449 filed 2-11-03. All were denied.

Accordingly, the federal petition was three years late. Untimely petitions are barred from federal court review. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

## CONCLUSION

The instant petition for writ of habeas corpus should be dismissed with prejudice as untimely under the AEDPA statute of limitations.

Dated: March 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
Attorney General of the State of California

**DANE R. GILLETTE**  
Chief Assistant Attorney General

**GERALD A. ENGLER**  
Senior Assistant Attorney General

**PEGGY S. RUFFRA**  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Michael D. O'Reilley

MICHAEL D. O'REILLEY

## Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Respondent

40223660.wpd  
SF2007401757

**DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL**

Case Name: **Badue v. R. Watkins**  
No.: **C 07-4612 VRW (PR)**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On March 3, 2008, I served the attached **MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION AS UNTIMELY** by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004, addressed as follows:

Steve Kent Badue  
P70520  
4964 Mack Road, #314  
Sacramento, CA 95823

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on March 3, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

---

Nelly Guerrero  
Declarant

---

/s/ Nelly Guerrero  
Signature